Initially, Applicant's attorney wishes to thank the Examiner and his Supervisor for conducting an interview with Applicant's attorney, David K. Sakata, on March 10, 2009. Applicant's attorney also sincerely thanks the Examiners for their insight and cooperation.

During the interview, Applicant's attorney distinguished the claims from the cited references. Specifically, Applicant's attorney asserted that the cited references did not teach or suggest the following emphasized features:

> wherein the inferring comprises **comparing** temporal lengths of repeat instances of the media object with one another **to determine different versions** of the media object (Claim 1)

Applicant's attorney understood the Examiners to tentatively agree that these features overcome the cited references. Applicant sincerely thanks the Examiner's for this indication.

Also during the interview, the Examiner suggested amendments focusing the claims to a specific environment. Applicant has accordingly amended claim 1 as shown above.

Thus, the pending claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.